

**Remarks**

Claims 14-21 and 25 are pending in this application.

Independent claim 14 has been amended to correct an obvious error to specify that the speed of the outer cover during the non-contact second printing operation is 100 feet or greater per minute (not per second). Support can be found in the specification at page 11, lines 24-30.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. The shortened statutory period for replying to the Final Rejection ends on January 14, 2011. This Amendment is therefore timely filed on December 17, 2010.

Turning to the specific grounds of rejection, claims 14-21 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement by reciting an outer cover speed of 100 feet or greater per second. (It is noted that claims 18-21 do not recite the speed in question.) As pointed out by the Examiner, this speed should have been expressed in terms of feet per minute, not feet per second. Therefore, independent claim 14 has been amended to recite the speed in terms of feet per minute in order to overcome this basis for rejection.

Claims 14-17, 21 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication No. 2000-000266 to Masaru (hereinafter "Masaru") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,129,264 to Travers et al. (hereinafter "Travers"), U.S. Publication No. 2004/0231539 to Clinton (hereinafter "Clinton") or U.S. Patent No. 6,343,550 to Feesler (hereinafter "Feesler"), U.S. Patent No. 5,503,076 to Yeo (hereinafter "Yeo"), U.S. Patent No. 6,732,778 to Machida et al. (hereinafter "Machida") and U.S. Patent No. 6,297,424 to Olson et al. (hereinafter "Olson"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the same reasons set forth in the previous Response and ask for reconsideration in light of Applicants' earlier remarks.

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action as being unpatentable over Masaru in view of Travers, Clinton or Feesler, U.S. Publication No. 2005/0149389 to Odorzynski (hereinafter "Odorzynski") and U.S. Patent No. 6,307,119 to Cammarota et al. (hereinafter "Cammarota"). Applicants also respectfully traverse this rejection for the same reasons set forth in the previous Response and ask for reconsideration in light of Applicants' earlier remarks.

For the reasons stated above, we believe that all of the presently presented claims are in form for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. However, if the Examiner does not

Appl. No. 10/813,873  
Response dated December 16, 2010  
Reply to Office Action of April 28, 2010

agree, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment After Final Rejection be entered for purposes of appeal since it reduces the issues for appeal. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicants have not addressed in this Amendment, Applicants' undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any prosecutorial fees (or credit any overpayment) associated with this communication to Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc. deposit account number 11-0875.

The undersigned may be reached at: (920) 721-8863 .

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN PATRICK COSTELLO ET AL.

By: /RandallWFieldhack/

Randall W. Fieldhack, Reg. No. 43,611

Attorney for Applicant(s)

#### **Electronic Filing Certificate**

I hereby certify that this correspondence and all attachments and any fee(s) are being electronically transmitted via the internet to the United States Patent and Trademark Office using the Electronic Filing System (EFS-Web) on December 16, 2010.

/Judith M Anderson/

Judith M. Anderson